

DESY 98 – 138
ITP–UH–22/98



September 1998
hep-th/9809121

A manifestly N=2 supersymmetric Born-Infeld action ¹

Sergei V. Ketov ²

*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Hannover
Appelstraße 2, 30167 Hannover, Germany
ketov@itp.uni-hannover.de*

Abstract

A manifestly N=2 supersymmetric completion of the four-dimensional Nambu-Goto-Born-Infeld action, which is self-dual with respect to electric-magnetic duality, is constructed in terms of an abelian N=2 superfield strength W in the conventional N=2 superspace. A relation to the known N=1 supersymmetric Born-Infeld action in N=1 superspace is established. The action found can be considered either as the Goldstone action associated with a partial breaking of N=4 supersymmetry down to N=2, with the N=2 vector superfield being a Goldstone field, or, equivalently, as the gauge-fixed superfield action of a D-3-brane in flat six-dimensional ambient spacetime.

¹Supported in part by the ‘Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft’

² On leave from: High Current Electronics Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Siberian Branch, Akademichesky 4, Tomsk 634055, Russia

The *Born-Infeld* (BI) action in the four-dimensional spacetime with a metric $g_{\mu\nu}$,

$$S_{\text{BI}} = \frac{1}{b^2} \int d^4x \left\{ \sqrt{-g} - \sqrt{-\det(g_{\mu\nu} + bF_{\mu\nu})} \right\} , \quad (1)$$

was originally suggested [1] as a non-linear version of Maxwell theory with the abelian vector gauge field strength $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$. The BI action also arises as the bosonic part of the open superstring effective action [2], an amalgam of the Born-Infeld and Nambu-Goto (NG) actions is just the gauged-fixed D-3-brane effective action [3, 4]. In string theory $b = 2\pi\alpha'$, whereas we take $b = 1$ in our paper for notational simplicity. In a flat spacetime the BI lagrangian takes the form

$$L_{\text{BI}} = 1 - \sqrt{-\det(\eta_{\mu\nu} + F_{\mu\nu})} = -\frac{1}{4}F^2 + \frac{1}{32}[(F^2)^2 + (F\tilde{F})^2] + O(F^6) , \quad (2)$$

where $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ is Minkowski metric, and we have used the notation

$$\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho\lambda}F_{\rho\lambda} , \quad F^2 = F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} , \quad \text{and} \quad F\tilde{F} = F^{\mu\nu}\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} . \quad (3)$$

The leading terms explicitly written down on the r.h.s. of eq. (2) agree with the *Euler-Heisenberg* (EH) effective lagrangian in supersymmetric scalar QED with the parameter $b^2 = e^4/(24\pi^2 m^4)$ [5].

For a later use, let's also introduce complex combinations of $F_{\mu\nu}$ and its dual $\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}$,

$$F^\pm = \frac{1}{2}(F \pm i\tilde{F}) , \quad (4)$$

which satisfy the identities

$$(F^\pm)^2 = \frac{1}{2}(F^2 \pm iF\tilde{F}) \quad \text{and} \quad 4(F^+)^2(F^-)^2 = (F^2)^2 + (F\tilde{F})^2 . \quad (5)$$

A lagrangian *magnetically* dual to the BI one is obtained via the first-order action

$$L_1 = L_{\text{BI}}(F) + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{A}_\mu \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} \partial_\nu F_{\lambda\rho} , \quad (6)$$

where $\tilde{A}_\mu$ is a (dual) magnetic vector potential. $\tilde{A}_\mu$ enters eq. (6) as the Lagrange multiplier and thus enforces the Bianchi identity $\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} \partial_\nu F_{\lambda\rho} = 0$. Varying eq. (6) with respect to $F_{\mu\nu}$ instead, solving the resulting algebraic equation for $F_{\mu\nu}$ as a function of $\tilde{A}_\mu$ and substituting a solution back into eq. (6) yields a magnetically dual BI action which has *the same* form as in eq. (1), but in terms of the magnetically dual field strength $*F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \tilde{A}_\nu - \partial_\nu \tilde{A}_\mu$ [6, 7]. The easiest way to check it is to take advantage of the Lorentz invariance of the BI action (1) by putting $F_{\mu\nu}$ into the form

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & f_1 & 0 & 0 \\ -f_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & f_2 \\ 0 & 0 & -f_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

in terms of its eigenvalues (f_1, f_2) , and similarly for ${}^*\widetilde{F}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{\mu\nu}{}^{\lambda\rho}\partial_\lambda\tilde{A}_\rho$ in terms of its eigenvalues (λ_1, λ_2) . It is now straightforward to verify that, given the first-order lagrangian $L = \sqrt{(1-f_1^2)(1+f_2^2)} + \lambda_1 f_1 + \lambda_2 f_2$ its magnetically dual one is given by ${}^*L = \sqrt{(1-\lambda_1^2)(1+\lambda_2^2)}$ indeed [8]. The non-gaussian BI lagrangian (1) is uniquely fixed by the electric-magnetic self-duality requirement alone, when one also insists on the correct (Maxwell) weak field theory limit. In general, there exists a family of self-dual lagrangians parameterized by one variable, all being solutions to a first-order Hamilton-Jacobi partial differential equation [7].

One expects that 4d supersymmetry should be also compatible with the electric-magnetic self-duality of the BI action (1) since the electric-magnetic duality transformations commute with spacetime symmetries. It turns out to be the case indeed, after promoting the abelian vector field A_μ to a vector supermultiplet and supersymmetrizing both the BI action and its duality transformations (see below). As a preparation for a supersymmetrization of eq. (1), let's use the identity

$$-\det(\eta_{\mu\nu} + F_{\mu\nu}) = 1 + \frac{1}{2}F^2 + \frac{1}{8}(F^2)^2 - \frac{1}{4}F^4 = 1 + \frac{1}{2}F^2 - \frac{1}{16}(F\tilde{F})^2, \quad (8)$$

where we have introduced $F^4 \equiv F_{\mu\nu}F^{\nu\lambda}F_{\lambda\rho}F^{\rho\mu}$, as well as yet another identity

$$F^4 = \frac{1}{4}(F\tilde{F})^2 + \frac{1}{2}(F^2)^2. \quad (9)$$

The BI action in any dimension d is often put into another form [8],

$$L_4 = \int d^4x \left[1 + \frac{1}{2}\Lambda \det(\eta_{\mu\nu} + F_{\mu\nu}) - \frac{1}{2\Lambda} \right], \quad (10)$$

where the auxiliary field Λ has been introduced. However, eq. (10) does not seem to be a good starting point for supersymmetrization in $d = 4$ spacetime dimensions. Instead, let's define

$$A \equiv -\frac{1}{4}F^2 \quad \text{and} \quad B \equiv \frac{1}{32}[(F^2)^2 + (F\tilde{F})^2], \quad (11)$$

which essentially represent the Maxwell limit of the BI action and the square of the Maxwell energy-momentum tensor, respectively, and rewrite eqs. (8) and (2), respectively, as

$$-\det(\eta_{\mu\nu} + F_{\mu\nu}) = (1 - A)^2 - 2B, \quad (12)$$

and

$$L_{\text{BI}} = 1 - \sqrt{-\det(\eta_{\mu\nu} + F_{\mu\nu})} = A + B + \dots \equiv A + BY(A, B), \quad (13)$$

where the function $Y(A, B)$ has been introduced as a solution to the quadratic equation

$$By^2 + 2(A - 1)y + 2 = 0. \quad (14)$$

It is not difficult to check that

$$Y(A, B) = \frac{1 - A - \sqrt{(1 - A)^2 - 2B}}{B} . \quad (15)$$

A manifestly N=1 supersymmetric completion of the bosonic four-dimensional BI theory (2) is known [9, 10], whereas we want to find an extended version of the NGBI action with linearly realized N=2 supersymmetry. The corresponding action can be most easily found in the conventional N=2 superspace parameterized by the coordinates $Z^M = (x^\mu, \theta_i^\alpha, \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}i})$, where $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$, $\alpha = 1, 2$, $i = 1, 2$, and $\bar{\theta}_i^\alpha = \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}i}$, in terms of a restricted chiral N=2 superfield W representing the N=2 supersymmetric abelian gauge field strength [11, 12]. The N=2 superspace approach automatically implies manifest (i.e. linearly realized) N=2 extended supersymmetry. Our approach cannot, however, be used to construct a NGBI action with manifest N=4 supersymmetry since a 4d gauge theory with linearly realized N=4 supersymmetry merely exists in its on-shell version (in N=4 superspace).

The restricted N=2 chiral superfield W is an off-shell irreducible N=2 superfield satisfying the N=2 superspace constraints

$$\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}i} W = 0 , \quad D^4 W = \square \bar{W} , \quad (16)$$

where we have used the following realization of the supercovariant N=2 superspace derivatives (with vanishing central charge) [12]:

$$D_\alpha^i = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i^\alpha} + i \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}i} \partial_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} , \quad \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}i} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}i}} - i \theta_i^\alpha \partial_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} ; \quad D^4 \equiv \frac{1}{12} D^{i\alpha} D_\alpha^j D_i^\beta D_{j\beta} . \quad (17)$$

The first constraint of eq. (16) is just the N=2 generalization of the usual N=1 chirality condition, whereas the second one can be considered as the generalized *reality* condition [13, 12] which has no analogue in N=1 superspace. A solution to eq. (16) in N=2 chiral superspace ($y^\mu = x^\mu - \frac{i}{2} \theta_i^\alpha \sigma_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}^{\mu} \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}i}, \theta_\beta^j$) reads

$$\begin{aligned} W(y, \theta) = & a(y) + \theta_i^\alpha \psi_\alpha^i(y) - \frac{1}{2} \theta_i^\alpha \bar{\tau}^i_j \theta_\alpha^j \cdot \vec{D}(y) \\ & + \frac{i}{8} \theta_i^\alpha (\sigma^{\mu\nu})_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} \theta_\beta^i F_{\mu\nu}(y) - i (\theta^3)^{i\alpha} \partial_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \bar{\psi}_i^{\dot{\alpha}}(y) + \theta^4 \square \bar{a}(y) , \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where we have introduced a complex scalar a , a chiral spinor doublet ψ , a real isovector $\vec{D} = \frac{1}{2}(\vec{\tau})^i_j D^j_i \equiv \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\vec{\tau} D)$, $\text{tr}(\tau_m \tau_n) = 2\delta_{mn}$, and a real antisymmetric tensor $F_{\mu\nu}$ as the field components of W , while $F_{\mu\nu}$ has to satisfy ‘Bianchi identity’ [12]

$$\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} \partial_\nu F_{\lambda\rho} = 0 , \quad (19)$$

whose solution is just given by $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$ in terms of a vector gauge field A_μ subject to the gauge transformations $\delta A_\mu = \partial_\mu \lambda$. The N=2 supersymmetry transformation laws for the components can be found e.g., in ref. [12].

The choice of variables made in eq. (11) was actually dictated by the observation that their N=2 supersymmetric extensions are easy to construct. The well-known N=2 supersymmetric extension of the Maxwell lagrangian $A = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^2$ is given by

$$-\frac{1}{2} \int d^4\theta W^2 = -a\Box\bar{a} - \frac{i}{2}\psi_j^\alpha \partial_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \bar{\psi}^{\dot{\alpha}j} - \frac{1}{2}(F^+)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\vec{D}^2 . \quad (20)$$

The Maxwell energy-momentum tensor squared (B) is also easily extended in N=2 superspace to the N=2 supersymmetric EH lagrangian

$$\int d^4\theta d^4\bar{\theta} W^2 \bar{W}^2 = (F^+)^2 (F^-)^2 + (\vec{D}^2)^2 - \vec{D}^2 F^2 + \dots . \quad (21)$$

This N=2 supersymmetric generalization of the EH lagrangian also arises as the leading (one-loop) non-holomorphic (non-BPS) contribution to the N=2 gauge low-energy effective action of a charged hypermultiplet minimally interacting with an N=2 Maxwell multiplet [14, 15].

The gauge-invariant N=2 superfield strength squared, W^2 , is an N=2 chiral but not a restricted N=2 chiral superfield. As is clear from eq. (20), the first component of an N=2 anti-chiral superfield $K \equiv D^4 W^2$ takes the form

$$K \equiv D^4 W^2 = 2a\Box\bar{a} + (F^+)^2 - \vec{D}^2 + \dots . \quad (22)$$

It is now straightforward to N=2 supersymmetrize the BI lagrangian (13) by engineering an N=2 superspace invariant (*cf.* ref. [9])

$$L = -\frac{1}{2} \int d^4\theta W^2 - \frac{1}{8} \int d^4\theta d^4\bar{\theta} \mathcal{Y}(K, \bar{K}) W^2 \bar{W}^2 , \quad (23)$$

whose ‘formfactor’ $\mathcal{Y}(K, \bar{K})$ is dictated by the structure function (15), i.e.

$$\mathcal{Y}(K, \bar{K}) = Y(A, B) . \quad (24)$$

Note that the vector-dependent contributions to the first components of K and $\bar{K}$ are simply related to A and B as

$$K + \bar{K} = -4A , \quad K\bar{K} = B , \quad (25)$$

i.e. they are just the roots of yet another quadratic equation

$$k^2 + 4Ak + B = 0 . \quad (26)$$

We find

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Y}(K, \bar{K}) &= \frac{1 + \frac{1}{4}(K + \bar{K}) - \sqrt{(1 + \frac{1}{4}K + \frac{1}{4}\bar{K})^2 - 2K\bar{K}}}{K\bar{K}} \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{4}(K + \bar{K}) + O(K^2) .\end{aligned}\tag{27}$$

The proposed action

$$\begin{aligned}S[W, \bar{W}] &= -\frac{1}{2} \int d^4x d^4\theta W^2 - \frac{1}{8} \int d^4x d^4\theta d^4\bar{\theta} \mathcal{Y}(K, \bar{K}) W^2 \bar{W}^2 \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int d^4x d^4\theta \left\{ W^2 + \frac{1}{4} \bar{D}^4 \left[\mathcal{Y}(K, \bar{K}) W^2 \bar{W}^2 \right] \right\} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int d^4x d^4\theta W_{\text{improved}}^2 ,\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

can be nicely rewritten to the ‘non-linear sigma-model’ form

$$S[W, \bar{W}] = -\frac{1}{2} \int d^4x d^4\theta X ,\tag{29}$$

where the N=2 chiral superfield $X \equiv W_{\text{improved}}^2$ has been introduced as a solution to the non-linear N=2 superfield constraint

$$X = \frac{1}{4} X \bar{D}^4 \bar{X} + W^2 .\tag{30}$$

Eq. (30) is the N=2 superfield generalization of the known (and unique) N=1 superfield non-linear constraint of ref. [10], describing partial breaking of N=2 extended supersymmetry down to N=1 supersymmetry in four spacetime dimensions. This correspondence supports the uniqueness of our (further extended) action (28) and its physical interpretation as the Goldstone action associated with partial breaking of N=4 supersymmetry down to N=2 in four spacetime dimensions, with the N=2 vector multiplet as a Goldstone multiplet (*cf.* refs. [16, 17]).

It is also remarkable that our action does *not* lead to the propagating auxiliary fields $\vec{D}$ despite of the presence of higher derivatives. Though the equations of motion for the auxiliary fields may not be algebraic, free kinetic terms for them do not appear, with $\vec{D} = 0$ being an on-shell solution. Non-vanishing expectation values for fermionic or scalar composite operators in front of the ‘dangerous’ interacting terms that could lead to a propagation of the auxiliary fields are also forbidden because of the vanishing N=2 central charge and unbroken Lorentz- and super-symmetries.

To verify that eq. (28) is an N=2 supersymmetric extension of the BI action, it is useful to rewrite it in terms of N=1 superfields by integrating over a half of the N=2 superspace anticommuting coordinates. The standard identification of the N=1

superspace anticommuting coordinates,³

$$\theta^\alpha_{\underline{1}} = \theta^\alpha, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\theta}_{\dot{\alpha}}^{\underline{1}} = \bar{\theta}_{\dot{\alpha}}, \quad (31)$$

implies the N=1 superfield projection rule

$$G = G(Z)|, \quad (32)$$

where $|$ means taking a $(\theta^\alpha_{\underline{2}}, \bar{\theta}_{\dot{\alpha}}^{\underline{2}})$ -independent part of an N=2 superfield $G(Z)$. As regards the N=2 restricted chiral superfield W , its N=1 superspace constituents are given by N=1 complex superfields Φ and W_α ,

$$W| = \Phi, \quad D_\alpha^2 W| = W_\alpha, \quad -\frac{1}{2}(D^2)^\alpha(D^2)_\alpha W| = \bar{D}^2 \bar{\Phi}, \quad (33)$$

which follow from the N=2 constraints (16). The generalized reality condition in eq. (16) also implies the N=1 superfield Bianchi identity

$$D^\alpha W_\alpha = \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}^{\dot{\alpha}} \bar{W}^{\dot{\alpha}}, \quad (34)$$

as well as the relations

$$\begin{aligned} K| &= D^2 (W^\alpha W_\alpha - 2\Phi \bar{D}^2 \bar{\Phi}) , \\ (\bar{D}_{\underline{2}})^{\dot{\alpha}} K| &= 2i D^2 \partial^{\dot{\alpha}\beta} (W_\beta \Phi) , \\ (\bar{D}_{\underline{2}})_{\dot{\alpha}} (\bar{D}_{\underline{2}})^{\dot{\alpha}} K| &= -4 D^2 \partial_\mu (\Phi \partial^\mu \Phi) , \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

together with their conjugates. Eqs. (33), (34) and (35) are enough to perform a reduction of any N=2 superspace action depending upon W and $\bar{W}$ into N=1 superspace by differentiation,

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^4\theta &\rightarrow \int d^2\theta \frac{1}{2} (D^2)^\alpha (D^2)_\alpha , \\ \int d^4\theta d^4\bar{\theta} &\rightarrow \int d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta} \frac{1}{2} (D^2)^\alpha (D^2)_\alpha \frac{1}{2} (\bar{D}_{\underline{2}})_{\dot{\alpha}} (\bar{D}_{\underline{2}})^{\dot{\alpha}} . \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

It is now straightforward to calculate the N=1 superfield form of the N=2 action (28). For our purposes, it is enough to notice that the first term in eq. (28) gives rise to the kinetic terms for the N=1 chiral superfields Φ and W_α ,

$$\int d^2\theta (-\frac{1}{2} W^\alpha W_\alpha + \Phi \bar{D}^2 \bar{\Phi}) , \quad (37)$$

whereas the N=1 vector multiplet contribution arising from the second term in eq. (28) is given by

$$-\frac{1}{8} \int d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta} \mathcal{Y}(K|, \bar{K}|) W^\alpha W_\alpha \bar{W}_{\dot{\alpha}} \bar{W}^{\dot{\alpha}} + \dots , \quad (38)$$

³ We underline particular values $i = \underline{1}, \underline{2}$ of the internal $SU(2)$ indices, and use the N=1 notation $D^2 = \frac{1}{2}(D^{\underline{1}})^\alpha(D^{\underline{1}})_\alpha$ and $\bar{D}^2 = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{D}_{\underline{1}})_{\dot{\alpha}}(\bar{D}_{\underline{1}})^{\dot{\alpha}}$.

where the dots stand for Φ -dependent terms. The W -dependent contributions of eqs. (37) and (38) exactly coincide with the N=1 supersymmetric extension of the BI action found in refs. [9, 10] after taking into account that the vector field dependence in the first component of the N=1 superfield $K|$ is given by

$$K| = D^4 W^2| = -2D^2(-\frac{1}{2}W^\alpha W_\alpha + \Phi \bar{D}^2 \bar{\Phi})| = (F^+)^2 - D^2 + \dots, \quad (39)$$

and similarly for $\bar{K}|$.

The dependence of the N=2 BI action upon the N=1 chiral part Φ of the N=2 vector multiplet is of particular interest, since it is entirely dictated by N=2 extended supersymmetry and electric-magnetic self-duality. Let's now take $W_\alpha = 0$ in the N=2 BI action, and calculate merely the leading terms depending upon Φ and $\bar{\Phi}$ in eq. (28). After some algebra one gets the following N=1 superspace action:

$$S[\Phi, \bar{\Phi}] = \int d^4x d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta} \left[\Phi \bar{\Phi} + 4(\Phi \partial^\mu \Phi)(\bar{\Phi} \partial_\mu \bar{\Phi}) - 4\partial^\mu(\Phi \bar{\Phi})\partial_\mu(\Phi \bar{\Phi}) \right] + \dots, \quad (40)$$

where the dots stand for the higher order terms depending upon the derivatives of $\mathcal{Y}$. The field components of the N=1 chiral superfield Φ are conveniently defined by the projections

$$\Phi| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\phi \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(P + iQ), \quad D_\alpha \Phi| = \psi_\alpha, \quad D^2 \Phi| = F, \quad (41)$$

where P is a real physical scalar, Q is a real physical pseudo-scalar, ψ_α is a chiral physical spinor, and F is a complex auxiliary field. It is not difficult to check that the kinetic terms for the auxiliary field components F and $\bar{F}$ cancel in eq. (40), as they should. This allows us to simplify a calculation of the quartic term in eq. (40) even further by going on-shell, i.e. assuming that $\square\phi = F = 0$ there, even though it is not really necessary. A simple calculation now yields

$$S[\phi, \bar{\phi}] = \int d^4x \left\{ -\partial^\mu \phi \partial_\mu \bar{\phi} + 2(\partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \bar{\phi})^2 - (\partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \bar{\phi})^2 \right\}, \quad (42)$$

which exactly coincides with the leading terms in the derivative expansion of the action

$$S = \int d^4x \left\{ 1 - \sqrt{-\det(\eta_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu P \partial_\nu P + \partial_\mu Q \partial_\nu Q)} \right\}. \quad (43)$$

This strongly indicates on a possible six-dimensional origin of our four-dimensional N=2 supersymmetric BI action, which should be derivable by a dimensional reduction from a supersymmetric BI action in six spacetime dimensions by identifying the extra two components of a six-dimensional vector potential with the scalars P and Q . The very existence of the super-BI action in six dimensions is enough to ensure the

Goldstone nature of scalars in eqs. (42) and (43), as well as the invariance of our N=2 action with respect to constant shifts of these scalars.

It follows from eq. (16) that

$$\square \left(D^{ij}W - \bar{D}^{ij}\bar{W} \right) = 0 , \quad (44)$$

which implies that the harmonic function $\text{Im}(D^{ij}W)$ is a constant,⁴ i.e.

$$D^{ij}W - \bar{D}^{ij}\bar{W} = 4iM^{ij} . \quad (45)$$

The real constant $\vec{M}$ can be interpreted as a ‘*magnetic*’ Fayet-Iliopoulos term [18]. This term can be formally removed from the constraint (45) by a field redefinition of W , i.e. at the expense of adding a constant imaginary part to the auxiliary scalar triplet $\vec{D}$ of N=2 vector multiplet in eq. (18). We assume that $M = 0$ in eq. (45), which can now be enforced by introducing an unconstrained real N=2 superfield Lagrange multiplier $\vec{L} = \frac{1}{2}(\vec{\tau})^i_j L^j_i \equiv \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(\vec{\tau}L)$ into the action (28) (*cf.* ref. [19]) as

$$\begin{aligned} S[W] \rightarrow S[W, L] &= S[W] + i \int d^4x d^4\theta d^4\bar{\theta} L_{ij} \left(D^{ij}W - \bar{D}^{ij}\bar{W} \right) , \\ &= S[W] + \left[i \int d^4x d^4\theta W W_{\text{magn.}} + \text{h.c.} \right] , \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where the N=2 superfield W is a chiral (unrestricted) N=2 superfield, while

$$W_{\text{magn.}} = \bar{D}^4 D^{ij} L_{ij} \quad (47)$$

is the dual or ‘magnetic’ N=2 superfield strength that automatically satisfies the N=2 constraints (16) due to the defining equation (47). Varying the action (46) with respect to W , solving the resulting algebraic equation for W in terms of $W_{\text{magn.}}$ (see e.g., refs. [10, 17] for details), and substituting the result back into the action (46) results in the dual N=2 action $S[W_{\text{magn.}}]$ which takes exactly *the same* form as that of eq. (28). Hence, it is self-dual with respect to the N=2 supersymmetric electric-magnetic duality. Of course, the anticipated supersymmetric BI action in six spacetime dimensions cannot be self-dual with respect to the electric-magnetic duality since the dual to a vector is a vector again in four spacetime dimensions only.

A massless N=2 (Maxwell) vector multiplet may also be considered as a *Goldstone* multiplet associated with a partial spontaneous breaking of rigid N=4 supersymmetry to N=2 supersymmetry [16]. For instance, the action (28) is obviously invariant under constant shifts of the N=2 superfield strength W , if W is subject to the on-shell

⁴We assume that all the superfield components of W are regular in spacetime.

condition $\square W = 0$. Since the N=1 supersymmetric BI action [9] can be interpreted (and, in fact, also derived) this way [10], it is quite conceivable that a manifestly N=2 supersymmetric Maxwell-Goldstone action should be equivalent to the N=2 supersymmetric Nambu-Goto-Born-Infeld action. This implies a hidden invariance of the action (28) under extra two spontaneously broken and non-linearly realized supersymmetries. It is then the full (partially broken) N=4 supersymmetry that unambiguously determines the entire N=2 supersymmetric BI action (28) via the non-linear constraint (30). The Goldstone interpretation of our action (28) is also consistent with the standard interpretation of the effective (BPS-like) D-3-brane that breaks a half of supersymmetries in the type-IIB superstring theory [4]. In our case, there are only two scalars (P, Q) that can be identified with the collective coordinates of D-3-brane in the directions transverse to its world-volume, so that the dimension of the ambient spacetime is $1 + 5$. This case thus corresponds to the 3-brane considered in ref. [20].

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to J. Bagger for bringing the paper [10] to my attention, and E. Ivanov and A. Tseytlin for illuminating discussions and valuable suggestions. After this work was finished, I was informed by A. Tseytlin that a manifestly N=1 supersymmetric generalization of the four-dimensional NG action (43) was constructed in ref. [17].

References

- [1] M. Born and L. Infeld, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) **A144** (1934) 425;
M. Born, Ann. Inst. Poincaré **7** (1939) 155
- [2] E. S. Fradkin and A. A. Tseytlin, Phys. Lett. **163B** (1985) 123;
A. Abouelsaood, C. Callan, C. Nappi and S. Yost, Nucl. Phys. **B280** (1987) 599
- [3] R. G. Leigh, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A4** (1989) 2767
- [4] M. Aganagic, C. Popescu and J. H. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. **B495** (1997) 99
- [5] W. Heisenberg and H. Euler, Z. Phys. **98** (1936) 714
- [6] E. Schrödinger, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) **A150** (1935) 465

- [7] G. W. Gibbons and D. A. Rasheed, Nucl. Phys. **B454** (1995) 185
- [8] A. A. Tseytlin, Nucl. Phys. **B469** (1996) 51
- [9] S. Cecotti and S. Ferrara, Phys. Lett. **187B** (1987) 335
- [10] J. Bagger and A. Galperin, Phys. Rev. **D55** (1997) 1091
- [11] J. Wess, Acta Physica Austr. **41** (1975) 409
- [12] S. V. Ketov, Fortschr. Phys. **36** (1988) 361
- [13] S. J. Gates Jr., and W. Siegel, Nucl. Phys. **B189** (1981) 295
- [14] I. L. Buchbinder, E. I. Buchbinder, E. A. Ivanov, S. M. Kuzenko and B. A. Ovrut, Phys. Lett. **412B** (1997) 309
- [15] S. V. Ketov, *Analytic tools to brane technology in $N=2$ gauge theories with matter*, DESY and Hannover preprint, hep-th/9806009
- [16] S. Bellucci, E. A. Ivanov and S. O. Krivonos, *Partial breaking $N=4$ to $N=2$: hypermultiplet as a Goldstone superfield*, Talk given at the 32nd Intern. Symposium on the Theory of Elementary Particles, 1–5 September, 1998, Buckow, Germany: to appear in the Proceedings; hep-th/9809190
- [17] M. Roček and A. A. Tseytlin, *Partial breaking of global $D=4$ supersymmetry, constrained superfields, and 3-brane actions*, Imperial College and Stony Brook preprint, November 1998; hep-th/9811232
- [18] I. Antoniadis, H. Partouche and T. R. Taylor, Phys. Lett. **372B** (1996) 83
- [19] E. A. Ivanov and B. M. Zupnik, *Modified $N=2$ supersymmetry and Fayet-Iliopoulos terms*, Dubna preprint E2–97–322, November 1997; hep-th/9710236
- [20] J. Hughes, J. Liu and J. Polchinski, Phys. Lett. **180B** (1986) 370.